



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

suitable fac-similes, of all the dated manuscripts. Nor would co-operation be out of place in so extensive an enterprise. As CLARK finds Lowe too audacious and Lowe thinks CLARK a bit hesitant, the proper combination of safety and speed would indubitably appear in a history of Visigothic script by CLARK and Lowe.

E. K. RAND.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

The Atharvavediyā Pañcapāṭalikā throwing light on the Arrangement, division and text of the Atharva Veda Saṁhitā with a translation and an index of the pratikas. Edited by Bhagwaddatta B. A., Professor of Vedic Theology and Sanskrit and Superintendent of the research department, D. A.-V. College Lahore, 1920, 8° pp. 14 + 39.

Under the leadership of Bhagwaddatta the research department of Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College is showing noteworthy activity. Those interested in the Atharva Veda will be glad to see that it is directed largely to the task of rendering accessible the still unpublished ancillary literature of that Veda. In particular the class of works termed lakṣaṇagrantha or 'works devoted to the accurate description' of the saṁhitā seems to be the main objective. Of these the Caranavyūha (AV. Par. xlix. 4. 8) lists five—not four as has generally been understood: (1) caturādhyāyikā (2) prātiçākhyaiṁ (3) pañcapāṭalikā (4) dantyoṣṭhavidhir (5) bṛhatsarvānukramaṇī. Editions of the first four have been completed by these scholars, or are now nearing completion. The most interesting fact with regard to them is that the mss. collated for the caturādhyāyikā are said to contain considerable material not included in Whitney's edition. Interesting also is the fact that the prātiçākhyā is (as noticed already by Bühler; cf. Bloomfield, *The Atharvaveda*, p. 20) a distinct work. The Pañcapāṭalikā is then the third in the list just quoted; and this harmonizes with the subtitle given by the editor—apparently on the basis of some tradition—*trītiya lakṣaṇa grantha*.

In the occident the knowledge of this text has been a gradual acquisition. Whitney first noted certain short remarks in the colophons of his manuscripts of the Atharva and saw that they must be fragments of an "Old Anukramaṇī." Then Shankar Pandit gave more extensive quotations in his commentary; next these materials were worked up (cf. p. lxxi *et passim*) in the Whitney-Lanman translation. Now we are at last presented with the text in full. The edition seems—I must speak with reserve for I can use neither the introduction nor the translation

—to be based on three mss. and the Whitney-Lanman quotations. It may be presumed that these are the three mss. mentioned in Whitney-Lanman p. lxxii and that they are all the material available. The book went thru the press during a printers' strike, and has consequently a number of misprints which it is hoped to correct shortly in a second edition. Apart from these the editor has solved the problem of the *recensio* in good, workmanlike fashion which makes me all the more regret my inability to profit by his exegesis.

The broadest interest of this text is that it adds one more witness to a well-known fact—the painstaking philologic industry with which the Vedic theologians strove for the accurate perpetuation of their sacred texts. Beyond this, however, it throws light on certain details of the external form of the Saṁhitā which may be noted in connection with a short description of its contents.

The little treatise is divided into five chapters and twenty sections; but thru a mistaken repetition of 9 the number of the sections in this edition is reduced to nineteen. Chapter I, sections 1-4, treats in verse of the manner in which repeated portions of the text should be presented. In I. 4. 2 *tisrṇām atrivat smrtam* the word *atrivat* should have been printed as *pratika*; the meaning being that v. 23. 10-12 (= ii 32. 3-5) is an example of a passage where the abbreviation *iti tisrah* is to be employed. The reading of the Berlin edition and of most of Whitney's mss. for AV xviii 4. 26, and 43 is confirmed against 'Sāyaṇa' and Shankar Pandit by the citation of the latter verse as one to be abbreviated by the *iti pūrvā* formula. This is a typical example of the position taken by this text when these other authorities differ.

Chapter ii, 5-10 in prose mentions a classification of the hymns into *ṛkya*, *pariyāyika* and *yajus* and then proceeds to give book by book the usual number of hymns in an *anuvāka* together with the number of *anuvākas* that are exceptional. The text, in spite of its jejuneness, clears up several points in the interpretation of AV xix 23 about which the Whitney-Lanman translation was entirely at sea. In the first place *mahatkāṇḍa* is shown to mean, as Weber finally saw, the fifth book. For the item beginning *mahatsu* is placed between statements relating to Books i-iv and Book vi; it is said that with a single exception (later defined correctly as beginning with v 16. 1 and containing 6 hymns) its *anuvākas* consist of 5 hymns; and finally it is stated a few lines later that among the *mahānti* sc. *sūktāni* hymns are found consisting of all numbers of verses from 8 to 18 except 16. It follows, therefore, that AV xix. 23. 18 must mean: "To the book of the great hymns *svāhā*!" and that there can be no question of referring it to a "grand

division," or of transposing it to another place. AV xix 23. 1-17 must then refer to Books i-iv. If so, the additions " (in genuine Hindu fashion) merely for schematic completeness " are even more widespread than Lanman assumed; for in those books there are no hymns of 14, 15, 17 or 18 verses. I find no difficulty in believing that, and may point to the same force manifesting itself again at a later time when Sāyaṇa's text inserts between 19 and 20 *dvyrcebhyaḥ svāhā*. The item about Book vii in our text *rkasūktā ekarceṣu* seems corrupt. I may suggest ¹ *anekasūktā*, " the *anuvākas* comprise various numbers of hymns." Some such meaning is guaranteed by the later enumeration of the number of hymns in every *anuvāka*, showing that no norm had been mentioned. Then follows: *dvisūktāḥ kṣudreṣu* clearly meaning Books viii-xi,² (cf. Lanman's citation from the Major Anukr. p. clviii) a meaning that is obviously acceptable also for AV xix 23. 21. Later we shall see that the *Pañcapāṭalikā* handles Books viii-xi as a single book—with the hymns numbered consecutively. The meaning of *ekāṇṛcāni* for AV xix 23. 22 is then pinned down to Book xii, since the following verse is *rohitebhyaḥ svāhā* = Book xiii. The same meaning is possible for our text which reads *anuvākasūktā ekāṇṛceṣu*; but as the same is true of Books xiii-xiv, xviii as well, the meaning may have been extended to include them, or a sentence *rohita-sāurya-yameṣu ca* may have been lost. The problem is complicated by the mysterious term *ekāṇṛcāni*. To hazard a guess, these should be "hymns that comprise (an *anṛcasūktam*) a hymn that contains no verse from the *Rig Veda*." Now xii. i is such an *anṛca*, but there is nothing of the sort in xiii, xiv, or xviii; for xiii 4 as a *paryāya*-hymn is barred from the comparison. The matter is further obscured by the summary fashion in which the topic is closed: *kāṇḍasūktāḥ geṣe paryāyika-varjam*. This should probably be amended to *°sūktāḥ*—but the division intended for Book xviii is uncertain, for there is a variety of opinion about xvii or xvii-xviii; *vrātyaprajāpat-(ya)yor eva prthag vibhāṣitam uttaram yat*. Then follow a couple of obscure sentences—seeming to say that the normal length of a hymn varies according to the book, and that exceptions occur only in excess of the norm, and then the passage relating to Book v already cited.

The following section (6) gives the number of hymns in the *anuvākas* that are exceptions to the above rules. In Book vii

¹ The correction to *rk-sūktā* translated, Whitney-Lanman, p. cxlix, "among the one-versed hymns (the *anuvākas* consist) of hymns made of one verse" is nonsense in this context.

² They are called *kṣudrāṇi* "minute," I presume, because they are so long—oxymoron.

every anuvāka receives treatment, and after that book there are no exceptions. The arrangement follows the order of the saṁhitā, except that all anuvākas with the same number of hymns are listed together under the first occurrence of an anuvāka with that number. The divisions accord exactly with the Berlin edition.

Sections 7 to 10 give the number of verses for those hymns in Books i-vii which have a number of verses that does not conform to that given by the title (caturṛcāni etc.) of the book. The arrangement is the same as for the anuvākas, except that in Book vii the various items are arranged according to the number of verses (2-verse hymns, 3-verse hymns etc.) not according to the position of the first hymn in each item. The shift is probably due to the fact that the two systems happen to coincide for Book vi. For Book v the title (mahānti) suggests no number; accordingly no number is treated as a "norm" but the number of verses in each hymn is listed. Among these are two (v. 9, 10) with eight verses, the mention of which would be a departure from the system without parallel in this text, had 8 been regarded as a "norm" for this book.³ In the seventh book hymns 74 and 76 were postponed for separate treatment; otherwise the statements and implications about the hymn division are in exact agreement with the Berlin edition.⁴ The statements of the Major Anukramaṇī accepted by Lanman, p. cxlix n. are explicitly or implicitly contradicted: 68 and 72 are listed as 3-verse hymns, 6 as a 4-verse hymn, while 55 as being a 1-verse hymn is not mentioned. Twenty-six (not 30) hymns are listed as two-verse hymns and they are those of the Berlin edition. At the close stands the following: apacitām iti tadarthasūktāni catvāri|apacidbheṣajam|īṣyāpanayanam|vratopāyanam|goṣṭhavratīyaṁ ca to indicate a division: 74. 1-2 a cure for apacits; 74. 3 to exorcise jealousy; 74. 4 at the entrance upon a vow; 75. 1-2 for the goṣṭhavrata. The last hymn has been recorded as dvyrca in its proper place, and its inclusion here serves merely to give the student his bearings. The division is obviously sensible. A similar treatment of hymn 76 should follow or the hymn should have been listed among the caturṛcāni where there is, however, no temptation to haplography, which might render its omission there plausible. I assume, therefore, a lacuna at this point.

³ According to Whitney-Lanman, p. cxlviii, n. 2, the Major Anukramaṇī has such a deviation in specifying that i. 1 is a caturṛca. The Pañcapāṭalikā is consistent in making no mention of this fact, nor does it share the other two errors mentioned in this note.

⁴ When vii. 80 is cited as a caturṛcam there is a parenthetical remark that it includes an ekarcam to Prajāpati—clearly the third verse is meant.

Chapter iii, sections 11-14, contains prose lists ⁵ of the verses with one, three, four or five punctuation marks, implying that the others have two.

As the Berlin edition has generally followed closely the mss., its punctuation is usually that of the *Pañcapaṭalikā*. The latter differs, however, in classing as: 1-avasāna verses i 26. 2, 4, xii 2. 44; 3-avasāna iv 38. 7, viii 5. 22, xvii 1. 6-8, 10-13, 16, 18-19, 24, xviii 4. 88; 5-avasāna ix 5. 33. I have made no attempt to check the *dvyavasāna*, but have noted incidentally that xvii 1. 17 and xviii 4. 86-87 are printed otherwise in the Berlin edition. In the last passage Whitney-Lanman incline to bringing the text into harmony with the *Pañcapaṭalikā* by inserting an *avasāna* mark. The whole difficulty is apparently due to the failure (p. 869) to interpret correctly "the strange *ityātas*" of the *itiprabhṛti* . . . *ityātas* formula. In the "*Old Anukramanī*" *ityātas* occurs not only here, but in several other passages and always means "up to but not including . . ." The statement is consequently that verses 71-85 (not 71-86) are 1-avasāna: thus leaving verses 86 and 87 to be punctuated alike with two marks. It would seem that *ityātas* might then be interpreted *ity ā atas*. Returning to the above list, a comparison of the Whitney-Lanman translation will show that in all these instances the Berlin edition has departed from the manuscripts.

The fourth chapter, sections 15-18, deals with the number of verses in each *anuvāka*, or rather that is the subject up to the end of the seventh book. From the eighth to the eleventh book (incl.) the counting is, as we are explicitly told, by hymns. After that the count is by *anuvākas* which consist, however, always of one hymn except in the *parvāya* books. The chapter is metrical and the numbers called "norms" in the Whitney-Lanman translation are chosen merely to get the statements into a convenient metrical form. This is clear; but, if proof is desired, reference may be made to the treatment of Book vii to which two verses are given. The first says of the first five *anuvākas* that they contain so many verses above twenty; the second describes the last *anuvākas* without reference to any "norm," giving simply the numbers twice twenty-one, thirty, twenty-four, twenty-one, thirty-two. Book xiii is handled in the latter fashion simply because the numbers to be mentioned (60, 46, 26 *rcas* 6 *parvāyas*) are widely scattered. It offers no foundation for the theories of Whitney-Lanman, p. 708, cxi. The subject matter for Books i-vii occasions no comment. One verse (4. 15. 3) is assembled in Whitney-Lanman p. cxi, the others are given piecemeal at the ends of the *anuvākas*. I may

⁵ In the *tryavasāna* list the items for Books xvii and xviii have been transposed.

note that the obscure *ekatriṣaṣṭis tryaṇṭih* (p. 258) now turns out very simply *ekavṛṣas tryaṇṭih*; and the answer to the puzzle on p. 295 is: *dvyadhikāv apacid-dvitiyāu*.

Books viii-xi (the *kṣudrāṇi* cf. above) are next treated in seven verses. That the author regards these four books as a unit is manifested in many ways: (1) His system of presentation is to group all hymns with the same number of verses together, picking his examples from any book, for instance: *prāṇāya* (xi. 4) *brahmacārī* (xi. 5) *ca*

yāu te (viii. 6) *indrasya prathamah* (x. 4) *kutaḥ* (viii. 9) *ye bāhavas* (xi. 9) *ṛṭiyam* (viii. 3) *tu*

sapta ṣaḍviṅṇakāni tu

(2) All the *parvāya*-hymns are similarly grouped in one verse.⁶

(3) The author numbers across the division between Books viii and ix, calling ix 8 the eighteenth, ix 9, the nineteenth, ix 10 the twentieth hymn. That he does not cite from Books x-xi in the same fashion is due simply to metrical convenience, for he does cite xi 10 as the 'last' (*antya*) hymn.

(4) The next to the last verse, which clearly must be transposed⁷ to the end, lumps the rest of the hymns:

dve tisro viṅṇatīḥ pañca caturdaṣa caturdaṣa
catasrah saptānupūrveṇa ṣeṣāḥ syus triṅṇateḥ parāḥ

The remainder of the chapter occasions no comment beyond noting that Book xvii follows Book xviii through some accident.

The fifth chapter, sections 19-20, treats in verse of the subdivisions of the *parvāyas*. Its statements agree with the divisions of the Berlin edition except for the fourth and fifth *parvāyas* of ix 6 which are here made to contain ten *avasānarcas* apiece. The mss. are said to be divided.

Two points stand out:

1. There are in general two lines of tradition: (a) *Pañcapaṭalikā*—the majority of the mss.—the Berlin edition; (b) the *Major Anukramanī*—*Sāyaṇa*—the minority of the mss.—*Shankar Pandit*—and to some extent *Whitney-Lanman*. As a matter of *recensio* the first of these lines is entitled to the preference.

2. The *Whitney-Lanman* arrangement of the *Saṁhitā* into

⁶ But one *pāda* reached the *Whitney-Lanman* translation. So it seems worth while to quote the verse, which at least goes far towards settling the question raised by *Lanman*, p. 611 by confirming the division of the Berlin edition.

virāḍ vāi tu ṣaṭ parvāyā yo vidyād iti ṣaṭ smṛtāḥ
prajāpatis tathāikaḥ syāt trayas tasyāudano bhavet

⁷ At least two other passages are similarly misplaced, and there are besides probably the lacunas already mentioned. This points to a single archetype derived probably from a damaged (worm-eaten) manuscript.

three grand divisions i-vii, viii-xii, xiii-xviii is deprived of the support from the Pañcapāṭalikā claimed (cxxxix f.) by Lanman. It is not necessary to argue the matter in detail (the source of the error is largely the belief in "norms" for the anuvākas) for the one clearly marked grouping in the Pañcapāṭalikā is viii-xi which is confirmed by the Saṁhitā itself and is fatal to the scheme of the grand divisions. Whatever the merits of this arrangement may be, they are the results of nineteenth century logical analysis and destitute of historical significance. If the external peculiarities of the Saṁhitā can give any clue to the process of its compilation, they tend to point rather in this direction: Books i-vii are a section formed by the combination of two collections, both arranged according to the number of verses in the hymns, but one in an ascending, the other in a descending scale. A second edition is the kṣudrāṇi,—recognized as a unit in AV xix 23. 21,—four books viii-xi with the external peculiarity of having two hymns to an anuvāka. A third section is composed also of four books xii-xiv, xviii containing anuvāka-sūktas, and grouped according to subject matter in contrasting pairs bhāuma-sāurya, wedding-funeral.⁸ Within this section Books xv, xvi, xvii have been afterwards interpolated.

One may congratulate Dayanand College and Mr. Bhagwad-datta upon the publication of this text and look forward with interest to the appearance of its successors.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

Anaximander's Book, The Earliest Known Geographical Treatise. By WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL. Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. 56, No. 7. Pp. 237-288. April, 1921. Library of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 28 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass. \$1.00.

Professor HEIDEL has omitted, as being foreign to his purpose, a discussion of the philosophic theory of Anaximander, which forms the subject of a previous study by him in *Classical Philology* VII 212-234. He has likewise refrained from taking up anew the discussion of the word *φύσις*, which he has so exhaustively treated in "A Study of the Conception of Nature among the Pre-Socratics," Proceedings of the American Acad-

⁸ If my interpretation of *ekānrcāni* is correct, its use for Book xii can best be understood as originating in this group.